



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,202	08/17/2001	Boris S. Elman	00-8024	4924

32127 7590 06/29/2007
VERIZON
PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP
1515 N. COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 500
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909

EXAMINER

ANWAH, OLISA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2614

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

06/29/2007

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@VERIZON.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/932,202	Applicant(s) ELMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Olisa Anwah	Art Unit 2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15, 17 and 25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16, 18-24 and 26-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2614

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 8-12, 16, 18-24 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takagi et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0137945 (hereinafter Takagi) combined with Whitfield, U.S. Patent No. 5,995,824 (hereinafter Whitfield) and Walker et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,529,602 (hereinafter Walker) in further view of Rhee, U.S. Patent No. 5,524,137 (hereinafter Rhee).

Regarding claim 1, Takagi discloses:

a wireless communication device;

a memory coupled to the wireless communication device for storing two-way conversation data in digital form; and

a device interface for communicatively coupling the wireless communication device to a remote storage and sending

Art Unit: 2614

the stored two-way conversation data to the remote storage device (see Figure 1).

Again on the issue of claim 1, Takagi does not teach a user interface configured to allow a user of the wireless communication device to access, by way of a wireless network, the two-way conversation data stored in the remote storage device, the user interface including a plurality of data management functions that allows the user of the wireless communication device to manage, by way of the wireless network, the two-way conversation data stored in the remote storage device. All the same, Whitfield discloses this feature (see column 4). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Takagi with the user interface of Whitfield. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by allowing the user to listen the call contents and take any necessary action as suggested by Takagi (see paragraph 0068).

Further regarding claim 1, both Takagi and Whitfield fall short of showing that the plurality of data management functions include functions for editing the two-way conversation data stored in the remote storage device. Regardless, Walker covers

Art Unit: 2614

this limitation (see column 5). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Takagi and Whitfield with the data management functions of Walker. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by allowing the user to listen the call contents and take any necessary action as suggested by Takagi (see paragraph 0068).

Before addressing the claimed translating feature, the Examiner submits the remote storage of Whitfield is a voice mail system (see Figure 3). Hence, the two-way conversation data of the current combination is a voice mail message stored on the voice mail system (see column 4 of Whitfield). Returning to the issue of claim 1, none of the base references teach that the plurality of data management functions includes a translating function. Nevertheless, Rhee discloses this feature (see Figure 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Takagi, Whitfield and Walker with the multi-media messaging system of Rhee. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by allowing the user to listen the call contents and take any necessary action as suggested by Takagi (see paragraph 0068).

Art Unit: 2614

Regarding claim 2, see Figure 1 of Takagi.

Regarding claim 3, see Figure 1 of Takagi.

Regarding claim 4, see Figure 1 of Takagi.

Regarding claim 5, see Figure 1 of Takagi.

Claim 8 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2.

Claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3.

Claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 4.

Claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 5.

Regarding claim 16, unit 102 and paragraph 0067 of Takagi.

Regarding claim 18, Takagi discloses the two-way conversation data is audio data (see abstract). The combination of Takagi, Whitfield and Walker fails to mention the converting function is conducted by an audio-to-text converter that converts the audio data to text data. Regardless, Rhee covers this feature (see Figure 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Takagi, Whitfield and Walker with the multi-media messaging system of

Art Unit: 2614

Rhee. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by allowing the user to listen the call contents and take any necessary action as suggested by Takagi (see paragraph 0068).

Regarding claim 19, none of the base references show that the translation function is conducted by a text translation service that converts a portion of the text data from a first language to a second language. Regardless, Rhee covers this feature (see Figure 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Takagi, Whitfield and Walker with the multi-media messaging system of Rhee. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by allowing the user to listen the call contents and take any necessary action as suggested by Takagi (see paragraph 0068).

Regarding claim 20, Takagi discloses the two-way conversation data is audio data (see abstract). The combination of Takagi, Whitfield and Walker fails to mention the translating function is conducted by an audio translation service that translates at least a portion of the audio data from a first language to a second language. Regardless, Rhee covers this

Art Unit: 2614

feature (see Figure 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Takagi, Whitfield and Walker with the multi-media messaging system of Rhee. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by allowing the user to listen the call contents and take any necessary action as suggested by Takagi (see paragraph 0068).

As per claim 21, Takagi fails to disclose the user interface is configured to output at least one of text data and audio data. All the same, Whitfield discloses this feature (see column 4). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Takagi with the user interface of Whitfield. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by allowing the user to listen the call contents and take any necessary action as suggested by Takagi (see paragraph 0068).

Claim 22 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Regarding claim 23, Takagi discloses the storage location is a computer system (see Figure 1). Takagi does not clearly explain the user interface allows said user to access said data

Art Unit: 2614

in said computer system. All the same, Whitfield discloses this feature (see column 4). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Takagi with the user interface of Whitfield. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by allowing the user to listen the call contents and take any necessary action as suggested by Takagi (see paragraph 0068).

Regarding claim 24, see Figure 7 of Takagi.

Claim 26 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7.

Claim 27 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 18.

Claim 28 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 19.

Claim 29 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 20.

Claim 30 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 21.

3. Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takagi combined with Whitfield, Walker and Rhee in further view of Liukkonen et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,230,214 (hereinafter Liukkonen).

As per claim 6, none of the base references show the secondary device interface is a wireless interface that allows data transfer between the memory and the secondary device. All

Art Unit: 2614

the same, Liukkonen discloses this limitation (see abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the combination of Takagi, Whitfield, Walker and Rhee with the data transmission system of Liukkonen. This modification would have improved the system's efficiency by reducing costs as suggested by Liukkonen (see column 1).

Claim 13 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 6.

4. Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takagi combined with Whitfield, Walker and Rhee in further view of Bieselin et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,668,863 (hereinafter Bieselin).

Regarding claim 7, Takagi does not disclose the plurality of data management functions includes functions for archiving, playing back and deleting the two-way conversation data stored in the storage location. All the same, Whitfield discloses these features (see column 4). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Takagi with the user interface of Whitfield. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by

Art Unit: 2614

allowing the user to listen the call contents and take any necessary action as suggested by Takagi (see paragraph 0068).

Further regarding claim 7, both Takagi and Whitfield fall short of showing that the plurality of data management functions include functions for downloading and editing the two-way conversation data stored in the remote storage device. Regardless, Walker covers this limitation (see column 5). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Takagi and Whitfield with the data management functions of Walker. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by allowing the user to listen the call contents and take any necessary action as suggested by Takagi (see paragraph 0068).

Before addressing the claimed converting and sending features, the Examiner submits that because of Whitfield, the remote storage is a voice mail system (see Figure 3). Hence, the two-way conversation data of the current combination is a voice mail message stored on the voice mail system (see column 4 of Whitfield). Returning to the issue of claim 7, none of the base references teach that the plurality of data management functions

Art Unit: 2614

includes functions for converting and sending. Nevertheless, Rhee discloses these feature (see Figure 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the combination of Takagi, Whitfield and Walker with the multi-media messaging system of Rhee. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by allowing the user to listen the call contents and take any necessary action as suggested by Takagi (see paragraph 0068).

Again on the issue of claim 7, the base references do not clearly show the plurality of data management functions includes functions for searching and linking. Regardless, Bieselin covers these limitations (see Figure 9B). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the combination of Takagi, Whitfield, Walker and Rhee with the user interface of Bieselin. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by allowing the user to listen the call contents and take any necessary action as suggested by Takagi (see paragraph 0068).

Claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7.
aim 20.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olisa Anwah whose telephone number is 571-272-7533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8.30 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

OA
Olisa Anwah
Patent Examiner
June 21, 2007

Olisa Anwah